

Summary of December 30, 2013 RM 10.9 Removal Action Status Teleconference

Attendees

- EPA (Stephanie Vaughn)
- dmi (Stan Kaczmarek and John Rolfe)
- CH2M HILL (George Hicks, Gary Foster, Roy Weller, and Joe Hambrick)
- GLDD (Tim Briggs, Jeff Krug, Tom Cnudde, and Rick Anson)
- CDM (Sharon Budney, Ben Hammond, and Amy Picunas)
- USACOE (Beth Franklin)

Discussion Points:

1. Revised Capping Plan - Overview and Questions

- a. Removal of Armor Stone placed during first capping attempts – CPG (Stan) requested GLDD representative discuss proposed revised Capping Plan. Tim Briggs provided an overview of the proposed plan. Overview included: Rock sheathing excavation bucket for rock removal, process for adding additional capping material (if needed), fabrication of barge assembly for submerging and tensioning the fabric, alignment of geotextile fabric , change in geotextile fabric, placement of anchor stone, and additional equipment (winch truck) required for fabric placement.

- b. GLDD discussed method of installing geotextile sheets using a tension system
Q - CDM (Sharon) – What is the process for mixing and placement of additional capping material?

A – GLDD (Tim) – Manual mixing on barge and placement via the excavator bucket

Q – EPA (Stephanie) general comments on timing of revised Capping Plan submittal.

Requesting such a quick review is unacceptable, though a quick initial review has been performed and some concerns have been identified.

CPG (Stan) responded to concerns, stating that plan was submitted to begin discussions and start getting alignment on how to move the armoring process ahead in a timely fashion that all parties can agree is beneficial.

CH2M HILL (George) questioned whether plan was submitted as informational or technically approvable plans. CH2M HILL believes that the capping plan was submitted for informational purposes and not to seek approval of the means and methods to implement the approved design.

EPA and CDM posed 3 major concerns based on quick reading of revised Capping Plan

1. Does proposed new geotextile meet the design specifications? GLDD (Tim and Tom) indicated that they would create a table comparing the new fabric characteristics to the design specifications.

- a. CDM (Amy) stated that the fabric specification sheets in Capping Plans revision 8 differs from that in revision 6 and asked which would be the operative sheet.

- b. GLDD (Tim) responded that they needed to go to another supplier for

- geotextile material due to logistics and schedule in order to be able to get the fabric sewn 2-panels wide and placed on a roll for easier deployment.
- c. EPA (Stephanie) stated that new geotextile characteristics do not appear to match the design specifications. EPA stated that the person on EPA's side that would need to review the specs for the EPA is not available this week.
 - d. GLDD (Tim) responded that he would provide a table with side-by-side comparison of the geotextile specification, previously approved geotextile, and the proposed alternate geotextile.
 - e. CH2M HILL (George) stated that his design team would also review the specifications/requirements against the proposed alternate geotextile.
2. EPA indicated that the revised plan states that it would accept an 8 inch minimum thickness for the sand + AquaGate™ layer, but that the design is based on a 10-inch minimum thickness. GLDD (Tim) responded that the design specifies no less than 8 inches of the active layer, and that it has to average 10 inches across the entire RM 10.9 Removal Area. Therefore, minor areas disturbed during rock removal, must meet the 8-inch minimum thickness.
3. EPA indicated that the revised plan states that geotextile and armor stone would not be placed in Cut 10. CPG (Stan) replied that the plan will need to be clarified if it is not clear, that only the rock outcroppings in Cut 10 would not receive geotextile and armor stone, as approved in a Tech Memo on revised cap design for undercut areas which EPA indicated should be referenced in the next revision of the Capping Plan.

CH2M HILL (George) responded that identified changes will be addressed.

EPA (Stephanie) asked that the revised plan include an updated schedule.

2. Schedule and Logistics

- a. CPG (Stan) stated that Clay Street Bridge refused to open over the weekend, and that Hudson County reported that repairs would be made to bridge Tuesday morning.
- b. GLDD stated that raking operation will be pushed back to week of 1/6, with first day working on the active layer and cap likely being Tuesday, 1/7. Barges still need to be relocated to GLDD facility. GLDD proposes a 20 day geotextile + armor stone placement schedule. This will be followed by re-mobilization of the telebeltequipment for installation of habitat layer. Field work will be concluded with a survey of area in early February.

EPA (Stephanie) asked if CDM had any concerns with fabrication of geotextile equipment – none were raised.

EPA stated that geotextile fabric needs to be reviewed to confirm that material meets spec. CPG and CH2M HILL stated that specs will be reviewed to confirm that the material is acceptable and those results will be submitted to EPA.

Q – CDM – Were turbidity monitors removed? – NO, but they will need to be recalibrated and possibly re-positioned.

Q – EPA – Any night time work scheduled? – GLDD responded that lights are available to

take advantage of tidal situations if needed.

Q – EPA – Notification needed for land activities for capping operations from town.

CPG – Formal notification will be submitted

3. Status of EPA Approvals

a. Dredging – CPG requested approval

EPA responded that dredging has not met design in regards to utility zones, hard pan areas, and rock crop areas. Approval may only be provided after the final removal report is submitted. And EPA is still awaiting plans for addressing areas that were not dredged.

b. Active Layer – CPG requested approval

EPA responded that review is still ongoing. Concerns remain that letter of design has not been met. Final removal action report will need to have all concerns addressed and explained. EPA indicated that interim approvals prior to submittal of the Final Report will not be provided. CPG (Stan) responded that they will need more definition of EPA's concerns prior to writing that Final Report.